UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/070,282	04/15/2002	Shankar Subramanian	PER0020	2887
27624 AKZO NOBEL	EXAM	EXAMINER		
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT			TUCKER, PHILIP C	
120 WHITE PLAINS ROAD 3RD FLOOR TARRTOWN, NY 10591		OOR	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			1712	
			·	
SHORTENED STATUTORY	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MON	NTHS	04/03/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary				-T A1			
		10/070,282	SUBRAMANIAN E	- I AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Philip C. Tucker	1712				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication a or Reply	ppears on the cover shee	t with the correspondence ad	aress			
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu - Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP CHEVER IS LONGER; FROM THE MAILING nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perior te to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMU I.136(a). In no event, however, ma d will apply and will expire SIX (6) late, cause the application to becom	JNICATION. By a reply be timely filed MONTHS from the mailing date of this on the ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09</u>	January 2007					
·	·	nis action is non-final.					
	· ·						
,_	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	on of Claims						
41⊠	Claim(s) <u>6-11,13,15-24 and 30-39</u> is/are pen	ding in the application		•			
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
•							
	⊠ Claim(s) <u>35</u> is/are objected to.						
8)[Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	or election requirement.					
Applicati	on Papers						
9)□	The specification is objected to by the Exami	ner					
•	10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre		· ·	FR 1.121(d).			
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the			• •			
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119			•			
12) 🗌 .	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig	n priority under 35 U.S.0	C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
a)[☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:		•				
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
	2. Certified copies of the priority docume						
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the pr	·	en received in this National	Stage			
• •	application from the International Bure	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •					
* 8	See the attached detailed Office action for a li	st of the certified copies i	not received.				
			•				
	4.						
Attachment	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892)	A)	ou Summan, IDTO 4403				
	e of References Cited (P10-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PT0-948)		ew Summary (PTO-413) No(s)/Mail Date				
3) 🔀 Inform	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) D Notice	of Informal Patent Application				
rape	r No(s)/Mail Date	6) L Other:	 .				

Application/Control Number: 10/070,282 Page 2

Art Unit: 1712

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claims 15, 23 and 30 are objected to because of the following informalities:
 These claims have alkyl, and hydroxyl alkyl listed twice in the definition of R2 and R3.
 Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 3. Claims 6-11, 13, 15-22, 34, 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 15 teaches "an effective amount of one cationic surfactant", without teaching what such is effective to accomplish.

Claim 11 depends upon cancelled claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 1712

5. Claims 23, 24, 30 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by WO 94/17154.

WO '154 teaches a method of removing particles from a wellbore, such as in a drilling method, which comprises using a surfactant within the scope of the present invention (see the compound at page 10, lines 20-25). The composition comprises a fatty acid or salt (claim 4), and an acid such as sulfuric or hydrochloric acid is added at various points of use, which supply the anion X (page 7, lines 23-31). Such would clearly reduce friction as in claim 30. The present invention is thus anticipated by WO '154.

Double Patenting

6. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Application/Control Number: 10/070,282

Page 4

Art Unit: 1712

7. Claims 31-33, 36 and 39 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-4, 12 and 13 of copending Application No. 11/701353. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because although the claims of 11/701353 do not specify the amount of salt or surfactant, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill to vary the concentrations thereof, in order to obtain optimum fluids for various well treatments.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

- 8. Claim 35 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 9. Applicant's amendment is noted, which overcomes the previous objections. New rejections are presented in this action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip C. Tucker whose telephone number is 571-272-1095. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, Flexible schedule.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Randy Gulakowski can be reached on 571-272-1302. The fax phone

Application/Control Number: 10/070,282

Art Unit: 1712

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

> Philip C Tucker **Primary Examiner** Art Unit 1712

Page 5

PCT-4151